2:Seligman & Seligman E-5 (1909-1910) 1932
FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

584 had been handed over. When she grew up her father wished to arrange another marriage for her, but was obliged to repay the cow.

586 Mr. Heasty sent the following information concerning the disposal of children after divorce. If the bride-wealth is not returned the children will remain with their father, but if it is returned—and this really constitutes divorce—the husband has to give up the children. The new husband who provides the bride-wealth will take the children and they will become members of his *kwa*. When such lads grow [593] up the true father will often entice them back; this is becoming a common practice, but was formerly confined to members of the *kwareth*.

• 848 The position of children born out of wedlock shows the same principle as is seen in the treatment of children after divorce, viz. the importance of the bride-wealth in establishing sociological fatherhood, physiological fatherhood having no legal importance. If a girl has one child before marriage the child belongs to the husband who provides the bride-wealth, which would be the same as if she had no child. But if she has two children then her father would keep them, they would be members of his *kwa* and he would accept less bride-wealth. This, however, seldom happens, as girls are usually betrothed as soon as they reach puberty.

684 The fine for adultery was said to be seven head of cattle—four cows and three bulls—but the number varied, and it may be supposed that the adultery fine would be less than the bride-wealth; three cows and one bull seem a usual fine. Mr. Heasty states that if a girl who is betrothed becomes pregnant by another man the lover will pay seven head of cattle to the father, but the child will belong to her future husband, who has provided the bride-wealth. Unconfessed adultery was said to cause the death of the child.

A fine is paid for seduction, but it seems that many cases that come up for judgment are really those in which a girl betrothed to another man willingly goes to a lover. It must then be decided whether the latter pays a fine or provides bride-wealth and marries the girl.

515 There is no objection to a man marrying two or more sisters, but, unless the second sister is taken in place of the first because the latter has proved barren, full bride-wealth must pass for each.

766 Hofmayr states that if a man of importance dies between the time
582 of betrothal and marriage a ceremony having as its object the provision

but the usual fine for making another man's wife pregnant consists of three cows and one bull; if pregnancy does not result the fine is two head of cattle. Fines for seduction are paid to the girl's father and vary from one to three head of cattle according to whether or not the girl is made pregnant. If a woman has committed adultery, she confesses it at the time of childbirth; her husband then exacts the appropriate fines from the men concerned.

If children have been born outside marriage the eventual husband may take them over and will pay extra bridewealth cattle. Failing this, they are brought up in the *gol* of their maternal uncle and belong to his clan. He will receive the bridewealth paid on the marriage of the girls.(1)

Widow Inheritance

According to Westermann widows are inherited by the brothers of the dead husband or by his sons, who take the wives who are not their own mothers. He then adds that, if children are begotten from these wives, they belong to the family of the dead man and "they are like his own children."(2) This custom of raising up seed to the name of the dead man is general among the Nilotic tribal groups.

KINSHIP AND KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

Ora

The in-law relationship of *ora* has been commented on by Seligman and Pumphrey. It appears to have two particular applications, being used in a narrow and in a wider sense.

A man describes as *ora* all his wife's kinsmen and, strictly, all the kinsmen of the wives of the men of his own generation belonging to his own clan. This extension may be because he is allowed, at any rate in theory, to have access to the wives of such clansmen and temporarily takes over the in-law relationship with their parents. During the first years of marriage the members of the husband's *gol* have to respect and to avoid the members of the wife's *gol*. Pumphrey suggests that the basic reason for this is that the initial period of marriage is an unstable one and friction is gradually resolved as the bridewealth is paid off and children are born. To avoid friction the husband does not speak to his *ora* and meets them as little as possible.

In a wider sense the *ora* tie is connected with certain sex taboos. The breach of these taboos is believed to cause *deulo* sickness, a form of illness believed to affect both mother and child who will die unless the man who induced the mother to break the taboo will split a gourd in two and sacrifice a sheep.(3) There are certain *ora* relationships between lineages and one lineage will be *ora* to another. Thus, if men of lineage A have married women of lineage B, C and D, there are *ora* relationships between A and B; A and C; A and D. In such a case no men of lineages B, C and D

(1) Pumphrey, *S.N.R.* 1941, Vol.XXIV, pp.34-5.
(2) Westermann, *The Shilluk People*, 1912, p.114.
(3) Pumphrey, *S.N.R.* 1941, Vol.XXIV, p.29.

8:Howell, E-4,5 (1937, 1948) 1953 FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

even at this stage, complete. The husband has not yet acquired full rights in his wife and does not do so until the cattle payments (*kuny*) are at least substantially complete. It is, however, unlikely that the bride's kinsmen will consent to the *mogho thiek* unless they are satisfied with the payments.

Theoretically, the wife will not take up residence with her husband until these payments have been made in full and in any case not permanently until her first child has been born.[1] The fact that during this transitional stage, when the wife is still living with her family, adultery is regarded as a less serious offence (*kwor kwoh nian ajur*) than later when she is living with her husband (*kwor kwoh cie dhano*), indicates that full legal rights in her have not yet passed to her husband. The girl is in fact only betrothed, though, as among the Nuer and Dinka, bethrothal carries with it a degree of legal union and certain rights. Though completion of cattle payments should coincide with change of residence, this is not often the case and frequently a man, tired of waiting and unable to find the final two or three head of cattle, elopes with his betrothed.[2]

Pumphrey also states:

> Thus the marriage tie is complete as soon as the proffered sheep has been accepted, the cattle payments being in the nature of a concomitant transaction. Accordingly children born after the marriage tie is complete are legitimate, irrespective of a possible deficiency in cattle payments. The criterion of legitimacy, a question often in dispute, is not the sufficiency of cattle payments, but the acceptance or otherwise of the proffered sheep.

Ultimately, however, a man's rights in his wife and his children must depend on the payment of cattle. Analysis of disputes over marriage payments show that unless these are sufficient to satisfy permanently the demands of the wife's kinsmen, the union is unlikely to last. This does not mean that the ten head of cattle required are always paid in full, but those owing remain as a debt in the second generation.

Thus it seems safe to assume that the *mogho thiek* should be regarded as the ultimate ceremony which marks not only the change of residence of the bride, but also the final transference of legal rights in her to her husband. In fact this will usually coincide with the payment of at least an acceptable proportion of the bridewealth cattle.

The Distribution of Bridewealth

Pumphrey states that:

> Professor Seligman was at pains to discover how the cattle were divided among the relatives of the wife, and especially what was the share of the maternal uncle. In fact, only in the case already described does he receive anything; i.e. when he claims from the bridewealth of his niece such cattle as are in arrears from the marriage of his sister.[3]

There is here, then, a very definite difference between the system of distribution of bridewealth among the Shilluk and that current among the Nuer and Dinka. Among the latter peoples, even in unions achieved by the transference of very small numbers of cattle, there must always be a definite portion set aside for the maternal kinsmen

[1] A further cow (over and above the ten head of cattle for bridewealth) is expected after the birth of the first child.

[2] This is not the same as the ceremonial and conventional abduction which forms part of the *mogho thiek* ceremonies. Pumphrey says: 'The *mogho thiek* . . . sometimes ends with the "violent" removal of the bride by the kinsmen of the bridegroom', op. cit., p. 28.

[3] Op. cit., pp. 28-29.

586 *Action Divorce*: This is simply known as *tag*: disputes over divorce which are frequently brought before the Courts being known as *gniey tag*.

(*a*) If *A* marries *B* with ten head of cattle (or less) and a divorce is instituted, all cattle should be returned to *A* with the exception of one cow (in the past two) known as *kwor kwob*. The expression *kwor kwob* is used generally in reference to all kinds of sexual offences in which rights in women are violated and, as will be seen later, implies that compensation should be paid. Since the union is terminated and *A* has renounced his rights in his wife, the Shilluk say he must pay something for taking her virginity. It also refers to loss of domestic assistance in the home, for Shilluk sometimes say that this deduction is *kier mar*, which comes to mean 'compensation for services rendered in the home' and it is not considered necessary if the union is dissolved before the wife takes up residence with her husband. This deduction is still made even if the wife is to blame.

[684]

(*b*) *A* marries *B* and *B* produces children. Should a divorce follow, *A* can only claim return of his cattle after suitable deductions have been made for the children at the rate of five head of cattle for a girl and two for a boy. In such circumstances *kwor kwob* or *kier mar* would not be paid by the husband, who thus retains legal parenthood of his children. Otherwise, as will be seen later, the children would become *akuijo* (illegitimate) and belong to the wife's lineage.

[613] [848]

586 69 Two examples show the way in which such disputes are nowadays dealt with by the Courts.

Kak *wad* Banykwec *v.* Anyang *wad* Dwalo (1949)

[583] Kak married Anyang's daughter Nyabony for ten head of cattle, ten sheep and £E1.500m/m. in cash. One child was born of the union and, at the time of dispute, was about three years old. Nyabony then eloped with another man and Kak claimed the return of his cattle and other bridewealth. Anyang had already paid everything back with the exception of two cattle which he claimed should stand as legitimization fees for the child. The Court, however, held that the legitimization fees were covered by the offspring of the original cattle which Anyang had not returned to Kak and which Kak was not in fact claiming. No deductions were deemed necessary as *kier mar* was claimable by Nyabony's family in any case.

Adwok *wad* Deng *v.* Otong *wad* Deng (1949)

[583] Nyayolei (deceased) married Nyayei for eight head of cattle, sixteen sheep and goats, eleven baskets of grain and .500m/m. in cash. The marriage took place in ex-Fadlet's time

8:Howell E-4,5 (1937, 1948) 1953 FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

An analysis of Shilluk marriages has shown that many cattle which should be retained for bridewealth to be used by the bride's male kinsmen are, in fact, frequently paid away as debts, or slaughtered, or sold to obtain cash in times of famine. This is perhaps natural among the Shilluk, who have to place greater reliance on an agricultural economy, but whose agricultural activities are no more productive or reliable than are those in other parts of the Nilotic area.[1]

Pumphrey goes on to say,

accordingly it seldom occurs that, owing to the death of all the original marriage cattle, the wife's relatives become interested in the breaking up of the marriage. Possibly as a safeguard against this very contingency the Shilluk have a custom which compels the bridegroom, during the first three or four years of his marrige, to replace by living cattle any of the original cattle he paid as bridewealth which may die in the interim.[2]

It is not clear, however, at what stage of marriage the bridegroom is absolved from this responsibility. Some Shilluk say that it no longer applies when the marriage is finally confirmed by the birth of a child and the bride's change of residence.

Pumphrey adds that:

It is a natural corollary of all this, that the progeny of the marriage cattle are not reclaimed. The claim is for a roughly equivalent amount of cattle. This amount will vary according to the number of children borne to the man by the wife.[3]

The Legitimacy of Children

With regard to the legitimacy of children in case of divorce, we hear that, 'the children born of the dissolved marriage are legitimate irrespective of the smallness of the cattle payments and of the fact that the marriage was short-lived'.[4] Pumphrey mentions, not here but later, that a certain number of cattle must remain with the wife's family if the ex-husband is to retain legal parenthood of these children. If these deductions are not made, the children are automatically classed as *okojo*.

On this subject Pumphrey says,

If the wife had produced sufficient children to wipe off the whole bridewealth, the husband will be entitled to receive nothing upon the termination of the marriage, except that . . . if the marriage has been broken through his wife's bad behaviour the husband may be awarded the return of at least a part.[5]

My own investigations lead me to believe that this statement is incorrect, at any rate according to the principles of Shilluk law, for although a husband may be so exasperated by the conduct of his wife as to demand return of all his bridewealth cattle, he can only do so by waiving all legal rights in the children of the union, and he is unlikely to do this.

Among the Shilluk these questions arise principally in connexion with subsequent rights in the bridewealth cattle of a daughter. The question of nomenclature, impor-

[1] Crop production in Shilluk country is unreliable and erratic between the soil on the high ground in the immediate vicinity of the villages is exhausted, while the land in the hinterland is subject to flood owing to poor drainage.

[2] Pumphrey: unpublished records.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Pumphrey, op. cit., p. 26.

[5] Ibid., p. 33.

S:Howell E-4.8 (1937, 1948) 1953 FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

tant among the Nuer and Dinka, does not usually arise. The Shilluk seem to attach greater significance to physical paternity than do other Nilotes and the *okeje* male will usually be linked to the name of his *genitor*, even though this carries with it no legal rights. In the case of males there is often a tendency on the part of the maternal uncle or his heirs to deny to the *okeje* rights of inheritance or full participation in the reciprocal privileges of the lineage, so that his status is sometimes precarious and indeterminate.

Unlike the Nuer and Dinka, the Shilluk have no 'Ghost-Marriage'.[1] It is not stated as a fundamental obligation of kinship that a wife should be 'married to the name' of a dead kinsman, though the sentiment which dictates the custom among the Nuer and Dinka is not absent among the Shilluk. In this sense the Nuer and Dinka system is perhaps more individual than that of the Shilluk. Among the Shilluk continuity of the kinship group, not of the individual, is assured by normal legal marriage with cattle which might well have been used by the deceased for this purpose, but are not transferred in his name. Names are retained, however, by a belief in reincarnation. It is believed that the spirit of some ancestor appears in the new-born child which is then named after the ancestor. At the birth of every child a ceremony is performed, usually with the assistance of a *bay nak* who specialises in such matters, to determine this. The participants will ask, *'nee ada! yi ane?'*—'This one is brought by whom?' This accounts for the repetition of names in Shilluk genealogies, irrespective of sex, since there is no reason why the spirit of a female ancestor should not enter a male child or vice versa.

As will be seen later, a man who seduces a girl, if she subsequently gives birth to a child, cannot assume legal parenthood of his offspring except by marrying the mother and then only if at least some of the bridewealth cattle have been transferred, and the initial processes of marriage performed before the child is born. Theoretically, at least, children born out of wedlock cannot be legitimized and must therefore remain *okeje*. This does not apply if the father is betrothed to the girl at the time, provided that he eventually completes the marriage payments. It often happens, however, that a child born in these circumstances is adopted by the man who subsequently marries the mother, and marriage in these conditions usually brings with it legal parenthood of children born out of wedlock.

Violation of Rights in Women

Seduction of Unmarried or Betrothed Girls and Adultery

The seduction of unmarried girls is accounted a serious wrong among the Shilluk and one which demands compensation. The wrong is referred to as *dwee dwok nim gaw* and compensation is assessed, both currently and traditionally, at one ox. Pumphrey remarks that,

> '... an original seduction often eventuates in marriage, in which case the seduction payment is payable first and the marriage payment after (and over and above it). In such cases also marriage dates from the acceptance of the sheep and it is improbable that the girl's family will accept it until the seduction payment is completed.'[2]

[1] See Evans-Pritchard, 'Some Aspects of Marriage and the Family among the Nuer', *Africa*, 1936 and *Rhodes-Livingstone Inst.* 1946.

[2] Pumphrey: unpublished records.

8:Howell E-4,5 (1937, 1948) 1953 FJ23 Shilluk FJ2

This also applies to a girl who (on Pumphrey's definition) is already technically married, but still living in her father's home. The seduction of a girl in this condition (which I prefer to call betrothal) by an outsider is not considered a more serious offence than seduction of a girl who has not been bespoken. In such circumstances, too, the compensation is the recognised right of her father or legal guardian and not of her so-called husband. It is true that the latter will usually be expected to collect the compensation and to take action either directly or through the agency of the Courts, but he will ultimately hand over the ox to the girl's father. Seduction of a girl in these circumstances is not therefore adultery in the legal sense.

Seduction, whether of an unbetrothed or of a betrothed girl, if followed by pregnancy, is considered a more serious offence and demands a higher rate of compensation, which again is claimed as the right of the girl's father. This is known as *kwar par nino gier* and is nowadays fixed at three head of cattle.[1] Again, in the case of an unbetrothed girl, her own kinsmen will take action, but if the girl is betrothed, her future bridegroom will take up the matter on behalf of her family.

An act of adultery with a wife (in the full legal sense) demands an indemnity of two head of cattle (*kwar kwob ciɔ dhom*) payable to her husband.

The impregnation of a married woman (in the full legal sense) is a much more serious offence and the recognised compensation is *four* head of cattle[2]—*kwar par ciɔ dhom ɔɔ kwar par ciɔ ɔɔ*. The cattle are claimed by the woman's legal husband who will retain them unless there is a divorce, in which case they go to her kinsmen. In fact they would be deducted from the cattle which the wife's kinsmen should return to the husband on divorce and it is unlikely that he would hand them over, especially if they had been paid a long time before.[3]

If a divorce follows the offence the child will normally become *ɔdɛŋɔ* (unless legitimization fees are paid) and will be brought up by its mother's kinsmen. Otherwise, children born of adultery belong to the legal husband, even if the wife leaves him to live with her lover.

Adultery with the Wives of Kinsmen

As among other Nilotic tribes, the exaction of compensation usually depends on the relationship between the husband and the woman's lover. Pumphrey says,

> No *kwar* is payable where a man has relations with the *wife* of his brother or his father. In fact, little resentment is felt in such cases, especially if the offender is unmarried, the realistic view prevailing that it is better so than that he should incur cattle payments by rapine elsewhere.

This statement is substantially correct, though it must be realized that it does not imply that there is anything in the nature of the right of access to each other's wives by close kinsmen.[4] It is forbidden for two (uterine) brothers to cohabit with the

[1] Shilluk say that it was seven head in the time of each King (*reth*).

[2] Shilluk say that the number demanded in the past was eight.

[3] Unlike the Nuer and Dinka, there is no limit to the number of times a man may demand compensation for the adultery of his wife. Moreover, if several men are concerned, compensation is demanded in full from each. This does not apply if a child is born, as here only one man can be held responsible, and it is said that the woman will sometimes be prevailed upon to name the richest of her lovers.

[4] As suggested by Hoffmayr.

8:Howell E-4,5 (1937, 1948) 1953 F323 Shilluk F323

same woman and to do so would result in spiritual calamity and actual sickness (*dwak*) for which ritual expiation would be necessary, even though an indemnity would not be claimed. This spiritual bar does not apply to half-brothers though again no compensation would be expected. Immunity from the payment of compensation for adultery extends also to paternal cousins and agnatic kinsmen further removed in the kinship structure. The extent is variable—a link four to five generations back may still give immunity—but it appears that common residence in one hamlet or one settlement is a factor of importance. Shilluk say that this theoretical exemption of the law of adultery is less commonly accepted than in the past and that compensation is more frequently demanded. This may be due to the fact that legal machinery is now available for the settlement of such claims, though presumably public opinion in the matter is expressed in the judgements of the Courts. Moreover, the network of obligations to assist relatives in the payment of compensation of this sort was cast wider in the past. Hence, theoretically at any rate, those who would receive compensation might well be those upon whom lies the obligation to assist in its payment. The two obligations thus cancel each other out.

The following court case illustrates the procedure.

Ajak *wad* Fadiet *v.* Awow *wad* Awingjok (*kwar kwak nian ajar*)

Awow seduced Landeng, daughter of Akiec *wad* Nyaljok. Landeng was at the time betrothed to Ajak, who had paid nine head of cattle and thirty-six sheep. She had not, however, taken up residence with Ajak at the time of the offence and, since no child resulted, only one bull is claimable. The Court awarded Ajak one bull which will be handed over to Landeng's brother, since Ajak himself has no legal claim to it.

Akoc *wad* Agiu *v.* Taytung *wad* Deng (*kwar yar nian ajar*)

Taytung impregnated Nyandongkai (daughter of Bilayang, brother of Agiu) and she produced a girl-child. She was subsequently married to Ajing Amilwei for a full bride-wealth of ten head of cattle. The baby, however, remains with her maternal uncle and is *okinjo*. Her maternal uncle has full rights in the child and will receive the bride-wealth on her marriage. Neither her mother's husband nor her physical father have any rights in her at all. This case was brought before the Court merely because Taytung had not completed the compensation payment which he was ordered to do. (He had, in fact, only paid two out of the three.)

Onak *wad* Maykong *v.* Dogreg *wad* Ajwin (*kwar yar ete dhom*)

Dogreg seduced Onak's sister Agwer. She was at the time betrothed to one Bul Ayuil, but was living at home. A boy was born to Agwer after she had taken up residence with Bul, by then her legal husband. For this reason, the child (though actually dead) is considered to belong to Bul, though the compensation is claimed by Onak. The case was brought to the Court simply because Dogreg had paid no compensation which he had previously been ordered to pay by instalments. No dispute over legal paternity of the child or over the compensation cattle had arisen. Had the child lived (especially if it had been a girl-child) Onak might have claimed legal rights in it, though the ruling here, as we have seen, is that providing the child was actually born after the woman had taken up residence with her husband it should belong to him. In fact, the child was born a considerable time after Agwer had taken up residence with Bul. Otherwise the case might have been classed as *kwar yar nian ajar* and assessed at only three head of cattle.

17: Pumphrey G-5 (1934-1938) 1941
FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

182 583 591 her. The inconvenience of this arrangement acts as a spur to the husband to complete the payments as quickly as possible in order to get his wife home to do the cooking.

585 846 Thus a marriage tie is complete as soon as the proffered sheep has been accepted, the cattle payments being in the nature of a concomitant transaction. Accordingly children born after the marriage tie is complete are legitimate, irrespective of a possible deficiency in cattle payments. The criterion of legitimacy, a question often in dispute, is not the sufficiency of the cattle payments but the acceptance or otherwise of the proffered sheep. Incidentally if the wedding dance is proved to have been held this is usually sufficient proof of the acceptance of the sheep, so that the question at issue is usually whether or not the wedding dance was held. Naturally evidence about this, which is a function attended by a large gathering, is usually forthcoming.

585 [629] It is not always so, however, particularly where the marriage under dispute occurred some twenty years previously. In such circumstances if it is proved as a fact that more than four head of cattle have been paid then, since four head of cattle is the maximum payable for seduction, a strong presumption is raised that the union was a true marriage. Analogously a contrary presumption is raised if it appears that not more than one or two head have been paid, a presumption which would be rebutted only by proof that a wedding dance has been held.

586 [849] A marriage in which only a few head of cattle are paid is often dissolved since the woman's *gol* are apt to get tired of waiting and to marry her to another man. In such case the children born of the dissolved marriage are legitimate irrespective of the smallness of the cattle payments and of the fact that the marriage was short-lived. This question will receive a more detailed consideration later.

Customs Surrounding Marriage.

586 [578] Surrounding the elements necessary to the creation of the marriage tie is a mass of traditional procedure which serves to solemnise and make marriage as permanent as may be. Divorce entails a chain of acrimonious litigation not only wearisome to the litigants but likely to cause family disruption.

17: Pumphrey G-5 (1934-1938) 1941
FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

684 married and living with him. It varies from four head of cattle to one bull, its different types being :—

Kuow yar ete dhano	— for making pregnant the wife of another	4 head of cattle
Kuow yar wiou a jur	— for making pregnant an unmarried girl (or one who, although married, is still living with her own *gol*) — — — —	3 head of cattle
Kuow kuoke ete dhano	— for having relations with a married woman without resulting pregnancy — —	2 head of cattle
Kuow kuoke wiou a jur	— for having relations with an unmarried girl without resulting pregnancy (or with one who, although married, is still living with her own *gol*) — — — — —	1 head of cattle

835 837 Provided the appropriate payment is promptly made these cases produce little ill feeling. No *kuow* is payable where a man has relations with the wife of his brother or of his father (other, of course, than his own mother). In fact little resentment is felt in such cases, especially if the offender is unmarried, the realistic view prevailing that it is better so than that he should incur cattle payments by exploits elsewhere.

684 944 627 Sexual offences are seldom disputed. Those resulting in pregnancy come to light inevitably, for the girl will be questioned and will reply truthfully; nor will a man thus named ever deny. Cases not resulting in pregnancy come to light only when the woman, whether after marriage or before, is giving birth to a child. Shilluk mothers think that their labour is facilitated if they name to the attendant midwife every man with whom they have had relations. News is brought to her family of the names uttered and the woman's *gol* hasten to claim the requisite *kuow* from every man named. Sometimes as many as five bulls are claimed from five separate men, but sometimes when too many paramours are named the girls' *gol* are ashamed and do not claim at all. Although women who go to live in the towns often become prostitutes there is no prostitution in tribal life. Since the marriage age for men is on the average as high as twenty-eight extra marital relations are not uncommon.

684 [941] [637] [582]

• 891 [587] Children born outside marriage may be taken on by the man who eventually marries their mother. If so then he is made to pay extra for them at the rate of five head of cattle for a daughter and two for a son.

17: Pumphrey G-5 (1934-1938) 1941
FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

son. Alternatively, and probably more frequently, they are brought up by the *gol* of their mother and regard their maternal uncle *in loco parentis*. In such case the child, whether male or female, is termed *okwijo* and belongs to the clan of its maternal uncle. Such a child may have relations with the wife of his maternal uncle in the same way as a son may have relations with the wife of his father[a]. A girl who is *okwijo* will be married from the hand of her maternal uncle who will receive the entire cattle price.

APPENDIX I.

TREE OF THE KWAR RETH.

(N.B.—This is Hofmayr's tree, adopted by Professor Seligman and here reproduced with spelling alterations only.)

a. This fact well confirms the view that it is social expediency and no affair of blood which dictates the Agada taboo.